

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-14, 16-26, 28-31, 33-36, and 38-40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 17, 21, 26, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 15, 27, 32, and 37 are cancelled. A listing of claims is given at pages 3-9 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as shown at page 2 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Lay for the courtesies extended during the interview dated November 14, 2006. It was presented to the Examiner that neither of the cited documents taught nor suggested modifying the previous version. Examiner Lay agreed that this amendment overcomes Manber, *et al.* but further search would be required in view of Cudd, *et al.* Examiner Lay suggested that in view of the above amendments to claim 8 and the specification, amendments to drawings are not needed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claim 37 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This claim has been cancelled, and this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Objection of Claim 31

Claim 31 is objected to because of minor informalities. Withdrawal of this objection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 31 has been amended herein to cure the minor informality identified by Examiner. Accordingly, this objection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

III. Objection to Drawings Under 37 CFR 1.83(a)

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In view of the aforementioned amendments to the specification and claim 8 as suggested by the Examiner and as agreed in the telephonic interview dated November 14, 2006, it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-25 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-9, 12-25 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber, *et al.* (U.S. 6,920,609 B1) over in view of Cudd, *et al.* (U.S. 2004/0105127 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Manber, *et al.* nor Cudd, *et al.*, teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See MPEP §706.02(j).* The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicants' disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed invention discloses a system and method to facilitate online printing of web pages by employing smart techniques to allow a user to obtain a formatted version of desired content. In particular, independent claim1 recites *a preview component that visualizes a preview version of a printable page for a web user and allows the web user to modify the preview version according to user preferences.* Independent claims 17, 21 and 38 recite similar limitations. Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

Manber, *et al.* teaches a system and method for analyzing the structure of a web page in HTML or other markup language, automatically identifying and extracting desired information, and populating a database. As conceded by the Examiner on page 4 of the subject Office Action, Manber, *et al.* does not teach or suggest a preview component that visualizes preview version for a printable page.

Cudd, *et al.* relates to a method of forming a printable representation of web pages. The method includes dynamically adjusting the scale and height of individual frames contained on a web page so that the layout of the web page, as presented on the display screen does not exceed

the print media upon which the page is printed. The entire content of the original web page is formatted, shown for preview and then printed. For example, Fig. 19 of Cudd, *et al.*, describes a sequence of steps that show the overall print process. A particular frame is drawn at step 1914 while a print preview is generated at subsequent step 1928. However, after preview of the document at step 1928, Cudd, *et al.* does not teach or suggest any further editing of the preview document. Hence it can be concluded that Cudd, *et al.* is silent regarding *a preview component that allows the web user to modify the preview version according to user preferences* as recited by the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicants' subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. **Rejection of Claims 10, 11, 39 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10, 11, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Manber, *et al.* over in view of Cudd, *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Meyerzon, *et al* (U.S. 6,638,314). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Manber, *et al.*, Cudd, *et al.* and Meyerzon, *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 39. Claim 39 recites similar limitations as claim 1. In particular, as discussed *supra*, Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* are silent with respect to the claimed limitation of *means for generating a preview version of the user-defined printable page with features that allow a user to further modify the generated preview version of the printable page*. Meyerzon, *et al.* fails to overcome these deficiencies of Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.*.

Meyerzon, *et al.* relates to a computer based system and method of retrieving data from a computer network. A web crawl is performed by retrieving a set of electronic documents and subsequently retrieving additional electronic documents, based on addresses specified within each electronic document. The cited reference is silent regarding generating a print preview let alone teach a means for generating a preview version of the user-defined printable page with features that allow a user to further modify the generated preview version of the printable page as

recited in the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Manber, *et al.*, Cudd *et al.* and Meyerzon, *et al.* either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicants' subject claims. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 26-31 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 26-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber, *et al.* in view of Cudd, *et al.*, and further in view of Brown, *et al.* (U.S. 6,356,908). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Manber, *et al.*, Cudd, *et al.* and Brown, *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims respectively depend from independent claim 26. In particular, Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* are silent with respect to the claimed feature of *disposing a thumbnail reference of the at least one current web page on a portion of the generated preview version, the thumbnail reference provides access to a version of the at least one current web page prior to removal of the one or more sections.* Brown, *et al.* fails to compensate for these deficiencies of Manber, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.*.

Brown, *et al.* relates to a method for presenting content from a page in a distributed database. This page has a plurality of links to other pages in the database. A set of *thumbnail images of the linked pages* is presented to the user near the links to the linked pages. Hence, these thumbnails that refer to *other web pages* linked to the currently displayed web page. This is different from the subject invention, wherein, a print preview version of a web page containing a thumbnail reference of the original web page is generated. By providing a thumbnail reference of a current web page in its original form in a print preview, the subject invention facilitates easier editing as the user can maintain a frame of reference as to the original appearance and/or content of the web page. Hence, it is clear that none of the cited documents alone or in combination, teach or suggest all features of independent claim 26. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claim 26 (and the claims that depend there from) be withdrawn.

VII. Rejection of Claims 34-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cudd, *et al.* in view of Brown, *et al.* It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Cudd, *et al.* and Brown, *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

Independent claim 34 recites *a print preview page of a web page comprising at least a subset of content parsed from a web page and at least one of the following, a thumbnail reference of the web page prior to being parsed and a summary of the web page.* Cudd, *et al.* and Brown, *et al.* either alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose these novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

Cudd, *et al.* relates to a method of forming a printable representation of web pages. The method includes dynamically adjusting the scale and height of individual frames contained on a web page so that the layout of the web page, as presented on the display screen does not exceed the print media upon which the page is printed. The entire content of the original web page is formatted, shown for preview and then printed. The cited reference is silent about displaying a print preview page of a web page comprising a thumbnail reference of the web page prior to being parsed and a summary of the web page as recited in applicants' independent claim 34. Brown, *et al.* fails to compensate for these deficiencies of Cudd, *et al.* Brown, *et al.* teaches a method for presenting content from a page in a distributed database. A set of *thumbnail images of the linked pages* is presented to the user near the links to the linked pages. However, these are the thumbnails provided in the corresponding print preview page. Additionally, both Brown, *et al.* and Cudd, *et al.* fail to teach or suggest displaying a summary of a web page in the print preview version. Hence, a combination of Cudd, *et al.* and Brown, *et al.* does not result in the invention as described in independent claim 34. Therefore, it is concluded that the cited documents alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to independent claim 34 and all the claims that depend there from.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP513US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731